	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summa	arv	10/824,794		YU ET AL.	
	ai y	Examiner		Art Unit	
		Christopher RoDee		1756	
All Participants:		Status of Application	on:	_	
(1) <u>Christopher RoDee</u> .		(3)			
(2) <u>Annette Bade</u> .		(4)			
Date of Interview: 25 September 2006		Time:			
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	• •	ant's representative)			
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed: None					
Claims discussed: 19 and 20					·
Prior art documents discussed: None					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THI See Continuation Sheet	E GENE	RAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.					
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sed did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	ation. The eparate	e examiner will provide record of the substance	a writte of the	en summary of the interview, since	the substance
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applican	t/Applicant's Representa	ative Sig	nature – if app	ropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted counsel on 21 September to request permission for an Examiner's amendment to provide proper antecedent basis for claim terminlogy in claim 19 and to cancel claim 20 as a duplicate of claim 19. On 25 September the Examiner suggested an amendment to update the status of the copending applications on specification page 1. Permission was granted for these amendments..